

Elizabeth Fegan, Esq.
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
60 W. Randolph Street, Suite 200
Chicago, IL 60601
Telephone: (312) 762-9235
Facsimile: (312) 762-9286

Marc H. Edelson, Esq.
HOFFMAN & EDELSON
45 West Court Street
Doylestown, PA 18901
Telephone: (215) 230-8043
Facsimile: (215) 230-8735

Kenneth A. Wexler, Esq.
WEXLER WALLACE LLP
One North LaSalle Street, Suite 2000
Chicago, IL 60602
Telephone: (312) 346-2222
Facsimile: (312) 346-0022

Eugene A. Spector, Esq.
Jeffrey L. Kodroff, Esq.
John A. Macoretta, Esq.
SPECTOR, ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C.
1818 Market Street, Suite 2500
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 496-0300
Facsimile: (215) 496-6611

ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS

By /s/ Katherine Schmeckpeper
Nicholas C. Theodorou, Esq. (BBO# 496730)
Katherine B. Schmeckpeper, Esq. (BBO# 663200)
FOLEY HOAG, LLP
155 Seaport Boulevard
Boston, MA 02210

DATED: November 2, 2009

D. Scott Wise, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Michael Flynn, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)
Kimberley Harris, Esq. (admitted *pro hac vice*)

DAVIS POLK & WARDWELL

450 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10017

Attorneys for Defendant AstraZeneca
Pharmaceuticals LP

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I, Thomas M. Sobol, an attorney, caused a true and correct copy of the foregoing **Status Report** to be delivered to all counsel of record by electronic service pursuant to Paragraph 11 of the Case Management Order No. 2, by sending on November 2, 2009, a copy to LexisNexis File & Serve for posting and notification to all parties.

/s/ **Thomas M. Sobol**

Thomas M. Sobol, Esq.

HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP

55 Cambridge Parkway, Suite 301

Cambridge, MA 02142

Telephone: (617) 482-3700

Facsimile: (617) 482-3003

MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>California <i>ex rel.</i> Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.</p>	<p>03-CV-11226-PBS</p>	<p>Removed to C.D. Cal.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 17, 2006 – Defendant ZLB Behring LLC's Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 2050] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Defendant ZLB Behring, LLC's Individual Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 2181] ○ April 3, 2006 - Reply in Support of Defendant ZLB Behring LLCs Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Defendants Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint-in-Intervention [Docket No. 2343] ○ April 17, 2006 – Plaintiffs' Sur-Reply to Defendants' Joint and Individual Motions to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 2431] • February 13, 2006 – Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss and Joinder in Defendants' Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint-In-Intervention [Docket No. 2133] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ April 3, 2006 –Separate Reply in Support of Defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss the First Amended Complaint in Intervention of Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation [Docket No. 2346] • November 5, 2008 – State of California's Cross Motion for an Order to Produce Michael T. Ricks for Rule 30(a)(2)(B) Deposition [Docket No. 5666] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 6, 2008 – Dey Defendants' Opposition to the United States' Motion for an Order to Produce Michael T. Ricks for Rule 30(a)(2)(B) Deposition and California's Cross Motion in Support of Dey's Cross-Motion for a Protective Order [Docket. No. 5669], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Dey Defendants' Opposition to the United States' Motion for an Order to Produce Michael T. Ricks for Rule 30(a)(2)(B) Deposition and California's Cross-Motion and in Support of Day's Cross-Motion for a Protective Order [Docket No. 5670] • November 6, 2008 – Dey Defendants' Cross Motion for a Protective Order (re: Michael T. Ricks Deposition) [Docket. No. 5668] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 6, 2008 – Dey Defendants' Opposition to the United States' Motion for an Order to Produce Michael T. Ricks for Rule 30(a)(2)(B) Deposition and California's Cross Motion in Support of Dey's Cross-Motion for a Protective Order [Docket. No. 5669], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Dey Defendants' Opposition to the United States' Motion for an Order to Produce Michael T. Ricks for Rule 30(a)(2)(B) Deposition and California's Cross-Motion and in Support of Day's Cross-Motion for a Protective Order [Docket No. 5670]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>California <i>ex rel.</i> Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Labs., Inc. et al.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 21, 2009 – Defendant Sandoz Inc.’s Motion to Determine the Sufficiency of Plaintiff State of California’s Responses to Sandoz Inc.’s First Set of Requests for Admission [Docket No. 6392] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 21, 2009 – Declaration of Joshua D. Weedman in Support of Sandoz Inc.’s Motion to Determine the Sufficiency of Plaintiff State of California’s Responses to Sandoz Inc.’s First Set of Requests for Admission [Docket No. 6392-2] ○ September 4, 2009 – State of California’s Opposition to Sandoz Inc.’s Motion to Determine the Sufficiency of its Responses to Sandoz Inc.’s First Set of Requests for Admission [Docket No. 6480] • August 21, 2009 – Defendants’ Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6394] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 21, 2009 – Declaration of Brendan Cyr in Support of Defendants’ Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6396] ○ September 4, 2009 – State of California’s Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6482] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 7, 2009 – Defendants Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Reply Brief in Further Support of Their Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6582] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 7, 2009 – Defendants’ Reply Brief in Further Support of Their Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6582-2] • October 16, 2009 – State of California’s Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Sur-Reply Brief in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6596] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 16, 2009 – State of California’s Sur-Reply Brief in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Motion for an Order Granting Leave to Take Deposition Out of Time [Docket No. 6596-2]
<p>U.S. ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:06-21303</p>	06-CV-11337	S.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 31, 2008 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Motion to Compel Production of Documents from the United States [Docket No. 5173] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ April 25, 2008 – Memorandum by the United States in Opposition to Abbott’s Motion to Compel the Production of Documents [Docket No. 5254] • November 11, 2008 – Defendants’ Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., and the Roxane Defendants’ Joint Motion for Appointment of a Special Master [Docket No. 5675] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 11, 2008 – Defendants’ Joint Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for Appointment of a Special Master [Docket No. 5676]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>U.S. ex rel. Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., Case No. 1:06-21303 (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ December 8, 2008 – Memorandum by the United States Relating to the <i>In Camera</i> Submission of Documents [Docket No. 5750] ○ December 31, 2008 – Defendants’ Joint Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motion to Compel Relief on Outstanding Deliberative Process Privilege Issues and in Response to the Memorandum of the United States Relating to the <i>In Camera</i> Submission of Documents [Docket No. 5813] ○ January 15, 2009 – Memorandum by the United States in Response to Defendants’ Joint Motion to Compel Relief on Deliberative Process Privilege Issues [Docket No. 5847] ○ January 29, 2009 – Defendants’ Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Joint Reply Memorandum in Support of Their Motion to Compel Relief on Outstanding Deliberative Process Privilege Issues [Docket No. 5867] • June 4, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6096] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 4, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6097] ○ July 20, 2009 – United States’ Memorandum in Opposition to Defendants’ Motions for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6270] ○ July 21, 2009 – Motion by the United States for Leave to Exceed Page Limit [Docket No. 6271] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ August 12, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc. and Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey, L.P., Inc.’s Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motions for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6368] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ August 12, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc. and Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey, L.P., Inc.’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6369] • June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs’ Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6175] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Memorandum in Support of Its Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs’ Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6177], Declaration of David S. Torborg [Docket No. 6188], Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs’ Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6189] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 22, 2009 – United States’ Sur-Reply to Abbott’s Reply Statement of

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott, Inc. et al. (continued)			<p>Undisputed Material Facts Supporting its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and its Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions of Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6526]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – Reply Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6415] ○ October 19, 2009 – United States' Opposition to Abbott Laboratories' Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6600] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to File Oversized Brief in Support of Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6176] • June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6185] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6186], Declaration of David S. Torborg [Docket No. 6188], Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6189] ○ July 24, 2009 - United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317], United States' Response to Abbott's Statement of Facts in Support of Its Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and to Exclude Certain Opinions of Plaintiffs' Expert [Docket No. 6320] ○ August 28, 2009 – Reply Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6415] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 22, 2009 – United States' Sur-Reply to Abbott's Reply Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and its Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions of Plaintiffs' Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6526] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States' Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott, Inc. et al. (continued)</p>			<p>Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 22, 2009 – United States' Reply to Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Memorandum in Opposition to the United States' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and Sur-Reply to Abbott's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6524] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction Under the Public Disclosure Bar [Docket No. 6179] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 26, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.'s Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction Under the Public Disclosure Bar [Docket No. 6183] ○ June 30, 2009 – Declaration of Brian J. Murray (<i>in Support of Motion</i>) [Docket No. 6216] • July 24, 2009 – Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Partial Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6318] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ July 24, 2009 – United States' Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Partial Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6319], Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of United States' Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6321], Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Common Exhibits in Support of Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6310], United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317], United States' Response to Abbott's Statement of Facts in Support of Its Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and to Exclude Certain Opinions of Plaintiffs' Expert [Docket No. 6320] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 27, 2009 - Amended Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of United States' Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6322], United States' Notice of Filing First Corrected Declaration of Mark Lavine Submitted Exhibits in Support of United States' Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and in Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6323] • September 10, 2009 – Amended Exhibit 24 to the July 24, 2009, Declaration of George B. Henderson, II In Support of United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6498]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott, Inc. et al. (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 5, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Sur-Reply in Opposition to the United States’ Amended Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of Its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6569] ○ August 28, 2009 – Combined Memorandum of Defendants Abbott Laboratories Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. in Opposition to the United States’ Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6429], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Defendants’ Common Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6438], Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.’s Combined Response to the United States’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6439] Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.’s Combined Local 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6447] • September 02, 2009 – Amended Declaration of David S. Torborg [Docket No. 6476] • September 22, 2009 – United States’ Reply to Defendants Abbott, Dey and Roxane’s Combined Response to the United States’ Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6523]; United States’ Response to Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.’s Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6525]; Part 2 of United States’ Response to Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.’s Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6527]; Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Exhibits in Support of United States’ Response to Defendants’ Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Facts Pertinent to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6528] • October 5, 2009 – Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.’s Combined Reply to the United States’ Response to the Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Materials Facts Pertinent to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants and Defendants’ Response to Additional Statement of Facts by the United States [Docket No. 6568]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott, Inc. et al. (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Memorandum of in Opposition to the United States’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and Reply in Support of Abbott’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6440], Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Facts that Preclude Summary Judgment in Favor of the Government [Docket No. 6448] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 22, 2009 – United States’ Response to Abbott Laboratories Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Facts That Preclude Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6529]; United States’ Notice of Filing Declaration of Ann M. St. Peter-Griffith Submitting Exhibits in Support of United States’ Response to Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Facts That Preclude Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6530] • October 5, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Reply in Support of Its Statement of Additional Facts that Preclude Summary Judgment in Favor of the Government [Docket No. 6570], Defendants’ Notice of Filing Declaration of David S. Torborg Submitting Exhibits in Support of Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Reply in Support of Its Statement of Additional Facts that Preclude Summary Judgment in Favor of the Government [Docket No. 6571] ○ August 29, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Response to the Amended Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of United States’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6455], Declaration of Brian J. Murray [Docket No. 6456] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 22, 2009 – United States’ Reply to Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Response to Amended Statement of Undisputed Facts in Support of United States’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6531] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States’ Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States’ Reply to Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Memorandum in Opposition to the United States’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, and Sur-Reply to Abbott’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6524] ○ October 5, 2009 – Defendants’ Combined Sur-Reply to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6566], Defendants’ Notice of Filing Declaration of David S. Torborg Submitting Exhibits in Support of Defendants’ Combined Sur-Reply to the United States’ Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6567]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Abbott, Inc. et al. (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 21, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories, Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction Under the False Claims Act’s Public Disclosure Bar [Docket No. 6398] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 21, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject-Matter Jurisdiction Under the False Claims Act’s Public Disclosure Bar [Docket No. 6399] • August 28, 2009 – Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6416] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – Memorandum of Law in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6423], Plaintiff’s Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts [Docket No. 6417], Declaration of Ian Dew in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6418], Declaration of Susan Schneider Thomas, Submitted Exhibits in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6422] • October 7, 2009 – Corrected Motion by the United States to Quash Out-Of-Time Deposition Notices Served by Abbott Laboratories or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order [Docket No. 6579] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 7, 2009 – Corrected Memorandum of the United States in Support of the Motion to Quash the Out-Of-Time Deposition Notices Served by Abbott Laboratories and in Support of a Protective Order [Docket No. 6580] ○ October 13, 2009 – Memorandum of Abbott Laboratories Inc. in Opposition to the Corrected Motion by the United States to Quash Out-Of-Time Deposition Notices Served by Abbott Laboratories or, in the Alternative, for a Protective Order [Docket No. 6586] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 26, 2009 – Unopposed Motion by the United States for Leave to File Reply to Abbott’s Opposition to the Motion to Quash Abbott’s Out-Of-Time Deposition Notices [Docket No. 6612] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ October 26, 2009 – Memorandum of the United States in Reply to Abbott’s Opposition to the Government’s Motion to Quash Out-Of-Time Deposition Notices [Docket No. 6612-2]
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084	06-11337	S.D. Fla.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 11, 2008 – Defendants’ Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., and the Roxane Defendants’ Joint Motion for Appointment of a Special Master [Docket No. 5675] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 11, 2008 – Defendants’ Joint Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for Appointment of a Special Master [Docket No. 5676] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ January 29, 2009 – Defendants’ Unopposed Motion for Leave to File Joint Reply Memorandum in Support of Their Motion to Compel Relief on Outstanding Deliberative Process Privilege Issues [Docket No. 5867]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084 (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 12, 2009 – Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket. No. 6109] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 12, 2009 – Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket. No. 6110], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc. Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6111] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 12, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc. and Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey, L.P., Inc.’s Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motions for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6368] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 12, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc. and Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey, L.P., Inc.’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6369] • June 26, 2009 – Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Leave to File Under Seal the Unredacted Declaration of W. David Bradford, Ph.D. and Supplemental Figures A-K to the Declaration of Lauren J. Stiroh in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6174] • June 26, 2009 – Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6178] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 4, 2008 – Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6194], Concise Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6190], Declaration of W. David Bradford, Ph.D. in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6180], Affidavit of Pamela R. Marrs in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6181], Declaration of Lauren J. Stiroh in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6182-3], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Dey, L.P., Dey, Inc., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6184] ○ June 29, 2009 – Supplemental Declaration of Lauren J. Stiroh in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6204] ○ July 24, 2009 – United States’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States’ Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317], Response of the United States of America to Dey Defendants’ Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084 (continued)</p>			<p>of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6324]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Reply Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Dey's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6430], Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Response to the United States' Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6445] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States' Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States Reply in Further Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Dey Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6520] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 29, 2009 – Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss the Relator's Complaints for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction [Docket No. 6206] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 29, 2009 – Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Relator's Complaints for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction [Docket. No. 6209], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss the Relator's Complaints for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction [Docket No. 6208] • July 24, 2009 – United States' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6295] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ July 24, 2009 – United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Dey [Docket No. 6296], Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Exhibits in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6298], United States' Consolidated Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Dey Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6303], Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Common Exhibits in Support of Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6310], United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317], Response of the United States of America to Dey Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6324] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 30, 2009 – Notice of Filing Amended Declaration, and Corrected or Substitute Exhibits, and Errata [Docket No. 6331] ○ August 28, 2009 – Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Dey's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6426], Declaration of W.

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084 (continued)</p>			<p>David Bradford, Ph.D. in Further Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the United States' Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6426-122], Declaration of Lauren J. Stiroh in Further Support of Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6426-123]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – Combined Memorandum of Defendants Abbott Laboratories Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. in Opposition to the United States' Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6429], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Defendants' Common Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6438], Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.'s Combined Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6439], Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.'s Combined Local 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6447] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 02, 2009 – Amended Declaration of David S. Torborg [Docket No. 6476] • September 22, 2009 – United States' Reply to Defendants Abbott, Dey and Roxane's Combined Response to the United States' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6523]; United States' Response to Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.'s Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6525]; Part 2 of United States' Response to Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.'s Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6527]; Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Exhibits in Support of United States' Response to Defendants' Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6528] • October 5, 2009 – Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.'s Combined Reply to the United States' Response to the Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Materials Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, et al. v. Dey, Inc., et al., Case No. 05-11084 (continued)			<p>Summary Judgment Against Defendants and Defendants' Response to Additional Statement of Facts by the United States [Docket No. 6568]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Individual Local Rule 56.1 Statement in Opposition to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Dey [Docket No. 6432], Defendants Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., and Dey L.P., Inc.'s Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Response to the United States' Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6445] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 22, 2009 – Plaintiff's Reply to Dey's Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Facts [Docket No. 6513] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States' Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States Reply in Further Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Dey Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6520] ○ October 5, 2009 – Defendants' Combined Sur-Reply to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6566], Defendants' Notice of Filing Declaration of David S. Torborg Submitting Exhibits in Support of Defendants' Combined Sur-Reply to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6567] • August 5, 2009 – Joint Motion to Establish Page Limits for the Remainder of the Parties' Summary Judgment Briefing [Docket No. 6350] • October 13, 2009 – Motion of United States to Consolidate Cases for Trial [Docket No. 6584] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 13, 2009 – Memorandum of Law in Support of United States' Motion to Consolidate Cases for Trial [Docket No. 6585] • October 22, 2009 – Consent Motion to Establish Briefing Schedule and Hearing Date [Docket No. 6606]
United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., Case No. 07-10248			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 13, 2008 – Roxane Defendants' Opposition to United States' Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5680] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ December 2, 2008 – Reply Brief in Support of United States' Motion for Leave to File Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5732] • June 26, 2009 – Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation's and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6191] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 26, 2009 – Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation's and Boehringer Ingelheim

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., Case No. 07-10248 (continued)</p>			<p>Pharmaceuticals Inc.'s Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6192], Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation's and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc.'s Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6195], Declaration of John W. Reale Transmitting Documents Relied Upon in Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation's and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6193]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 29, 2009 – Corrected Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals Inc. Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6214] ○ July 24, 2009 - United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317] ○ August 28, 2009 – United States' Opposition to Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation's and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceutical Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6410], Response to Corrected Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceutical Inc. Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6411], Declaration of James J. Fauci Submitting Exhibits in Response to Corrected Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6412], Declaration of Patrick Ormond [Docket No. 6413-61] ○ September 22, 2009 – Defendants Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Reply Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6516] ○ September 22, 2009 – Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Reply to the United States' Response to Corrected Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6517]; Declaration of John W. Reale in Support of Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc.'s Reply to the United States' Response to Corrected Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6522] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States' Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519] ○ October 6, 2009 – United States' Sur-Reply to Boehringer Ingelheim Corporation and

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., Case No. 07-10248 (continued)</p>			<p>Boehringer Ingelheim Pharmaceutical Inc.'s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6575]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 26, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction Under the Public Disclosure Bar of the False Claims Act [Docket No. 6196] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 26, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction Under the Public Disclosure Bar of the False Claims Act [Docket No. 6197], Declaration of John W. Reale in Support of the Roxane Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction [Docket No. 6198] • June 26, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6199] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 26, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6200], The Roxane Defendants' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6202], Declaration of John W. Reale in Support of the Roxane Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6201] ○ June 29, 2009 – Corrected Roxane Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6207] ○ July 24, 2009 – United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317], United States' Response to the Roxane Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6294] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 28, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Reply to the United States' Response to the Roxane Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Statement of Additional Undisputed Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6425] ○ August 28, 2009 – Roxane's Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to the Roxane Defendants [Docket No. 6424], Declaration of John W. Reale in Support of 1) Roxane's Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Facts as to the Roxane Defendants and 2) the Roxane Defendants' Reply to the United States' Response to the Roxane's Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Statement of Additional Undisputed Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6427] ○ August 28, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Consolidated Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Government's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6431]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., Case No. 07-10248 (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 22, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Reply and Surreply to Roxane’s Consolidated Summary Judgment Memorandum [Docket No. 6514] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States’ Response to Additional Statement of Facts in Support of the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6515] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States’ Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Defendants’ Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519] ○ September 22, 2009 – Supplemental Declaration of James J. Fauci Submitting Exhibits in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6521] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● October 29, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants’ Unopposed Motion for Leave to File a Supplemental Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Material Facts [Docket No. 6617] ● October 29, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants’ Supplemental Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Material Facts [Docket No. 6617-4] ● July 9, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants’ Motion for A Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6254] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ July 9, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants’ Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for A Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6255], Declaration of John W. Reale in Support of the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for A Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6256] ○ August 20, 2009 – United States’ Opposition to the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6388], Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Exhibits in Opposition to the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for a Finding of Spoliation and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6389] ○ October 21, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants’ Reply in Support of Their Motion for a Finding of Spoliation of Evidence and for Sanctions [Docket No. 6605] ● July 24, 2009 – United States’ Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6290] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ July 24, 2009 – United States’ Consolidated Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6291], United States’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to the Roxane Defendants [Docket No. 6292], Declaration of James J. Fauci Submitting Exhibits in Support of Plaintiff’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Roxane Defendants’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6306], Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Common Exhibits in Support of Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6310], United States’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., Case No. 07-10248 (continued)</p>			<p>Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6316], United States' Common Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6317], United States' Response to the Roxane Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6294]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 30, 2009 – United States' Notice of Filing of a Corrected Exhibit 27 to the Declaration of James J. Fauci Submitting Exhibits in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Roxane Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6334] • August 28, 2009 – Roxane's Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to the Roxane Defendants [Docket No. 6424], Declaration of John W. Reale in Support of 1) Roxane's Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Facts as to the Roxane Defendants and 2) the Roxane Defendants' Reply to the United States' Response to the Roxane's Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Statement of Additional Undisputed Facts in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6427] <p>○ August 28, 2009 – Combined Memorandum of Defendants Abbott Laboratories Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc. in Opposition to the United States' Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6429], Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support of Defendants' Common Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6438], Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.'s Combined Response to the United States' Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6439], Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.'s Combined Local 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6447]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • September 02, 2009 – Amended Declaration of David S. Torborg [Docket No. 6476] • September 22, 2009 – United States' Reply to Defendants Abbott, Dey and Roxane's Combined Response to the United States' Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Common to All Defendants [Docket No. 6523]; United States' Response to Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.'s Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>United States of America ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. et al. v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., Case No. 07-10248 (continued)</p>			<p>Defendants [Docket No. 6525]; Part 2 of United States' Response to Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. and Roxane Laboratories, Inc.'s Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Material Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6527]; Declaration of George B. Henderson, II Submitting Exhibits in Support of United States' Response to Defendants' Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants [Docket No. 6528]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 5, 2009 – Defendants Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Dey, Inc., Dey, L.P., Dey L.P., Inc., and Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.'s Combined Reply to the United States' Response to the Combined Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Additional Materials Facts Pertinent to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Defendants and Defendants' Response to Additional Statement of Facts by the United States [Docket No. 6568] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 28, 2009 – The Roxane Defendants' Consolidated Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Government's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6431] ○ September 22, 2009 – Plaintiffs' Reply to Roxane's Response to the United States Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Facts [Docket No. 6518] ○ September 22, 2009 – United States' Common Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Cross-Motions for Partial Summary Judgment and Sur-Reply in Opposition to the Defendants' Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6519] ○ September 22, 2009 – Supplemental Declaration of James J. Fauci Submitting Exhibits in Support of Plaintiff's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and in Opposition to the Roxane Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6521] ○ October 5, 2009 – Defendants' Combined Sur-Reply to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6566], Defendants' Notice of Filing Declaration of David S. Torborg Submitting Exhibits in Support of Defendants' Combined Sur-Reply to the United States' Motions for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6567] • August 5, 2009 – Joint Motion to Establish Page Limits for the Remainder of the Parties' Summary Judgment Briefing [Docket No. 6350] • October 13, 2009 – Motion of United States to Consolidate Cases for Trial [Docket No. 6584] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ October 13, 2009 – Memorandum of Law in Support of United States' Motion to Consolidate Cases for Trial [Docket No. 6585] • October 22, 2009 – Consent Motion to Establish Briefing Schedule and Hearing Date [Docket No. 6606]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
U.S. ex rel. Ven-a-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Case No. 07-11618			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 28, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6437] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ August 28, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Memorandum in Support of Its Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6441], Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6442] • August 28, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Certain Opinions Proffered by Plaintiff’s Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6443] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ August 28, 2009 – Abbott Laboratories Inc.’s Memorandum in Support of Its Motion <i>In Limine</i> to Exclude Opinions Proffered by Plaintiff’s Expert Mark G. Duggan, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6444]
U.S. ex rel Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation Civil Action No. 00-10698		S.D. Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 26, 2009 – The Parties’ Joint Motion for a Scheduling Conference [Docket No. 6173] • July 21, 2009 – Motion for Leave to Amend [Docket No. 6273] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ July 22, 2009 – Consent to Amend Complaint [Docket No. 6286] • July 22, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Objecting to the Ven-A-Care/Schering/Warrick Settlement Agreement [Docket No. 6275] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ July 22, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Memorandum in Support of Its Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Objecting to the Ven-A-Care/Schering/Warrick Settlement Agreement [Docket No. 6276] ◦ August 7, 2009 – Settling Parties’ Joint Response to Motions to Intervene and to Otherwise Participate in Settlement Proceedings [Docket No. 6364] ◦ August 28, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Objecting to the Ven-A-Care/Schering/Warrick Settlement Agreement [Docket No. 6458] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 30, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Objecting to the Ven-A-Care/Schering/Warrick Settlement Agreement (<i>corrected</i>) [Docket No. 6458] • July 23, 2009 – The City of New York and New York Counties’ Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Objecting to the Ven-A-Care/Schering/Warrick Proposed Settlement [Docket No. 6288] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ July 23, 2009 – The City of New York and New York Counties’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion to Intervene for the Limited Purpose of Objecting to the Ven-A-Care/Schering/Warrick Proposed Settlement [Docket No. 6289] ◦ August 7, 2009 – Settling Parties’ Joint Response to Motions to Intervene and to Otherwise Participate in Settlement Proceedings [Docket No. 6364]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>U.S. ex rel Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 23, 2009 - Corrected United States' Objection to the Proposed Settlement Between Schering-Plough Corporation, Schering Corporation, Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation and Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, and Proposed Order [Docket No. 6283] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ July 23, 2009 – Preliminary Response by Schering-Plough Corporation, Schering Corporation, and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation to the United States' Objection to the Proposed Settlement and Proposed Order [Docket No. 6285] • August 7, 2009 – Joint Motion for Approval of the Settlement Between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering, and Warrick [Docket No. 6359] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 7, 2009 – Joint Memorandum in Support of Motion for Approval of the Settlement Between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering, and Warrick [Docket No. 6360], Affidavit of Sumanth Addanki [Docket No. 6361], Affidavit of Beth Trent, Esq. [Docket No. 6362], Declaration of T. Mark Jones, R.N. [Docket No. 6363-2] ○ August 21, 2009 – <i>Amicus Curiae</i> of the States of Wisconsin, Alaska, Idaho, Illinois, Kentucky, and Mississippi in Opposition to Entry of the Proposed Order Approving Settlement and Dismissal with Prejudice of Schering-Plough Corporation, Schering Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation [Docket No. 6403] ○ August 28, 2009 – United States' Memorandum in Support of Its Opposition to the Motion to Approve the Proposed Settlement Between Schering-Plough Corporation, Schering Corporation, Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation, California, Florida and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys [Docket No. 6414] ○ August 28, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Opposition to Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Between California, Florida, and Ven-A-Care and the Schering/Warrick Defendants [Docket No. 6457] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 30, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Opposition to Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Between California, Florida, and Ven-A-Care and the Schering/Warrick Defendants (<i>corrected</i>) [Docket No. 6457] ○ August 28, 2009 – The City of New York and New York Counties' Response and Objection to the Motion to Approve the Proposed Settlement Between California, Florida and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering and Warrick [Docket No. 6435], Declaration of Joanne M Cicala in Support of the City of New York and New York Counties' Response and Objection to the Proposed Settlement Between California, Florida and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering and Warrick [Docket No. 6436] ○ September 1, 2009 – Joint Memorandum in Support of Motion for Approval of the Settlement Between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-C-Care of the Florida Keys on

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
U.S. ex rel Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation (continued)			Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering, and Warrick [Docket No. 6471] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 4, 2009 – Relator Ven-A-Care’s Reply to Memoranda of Law in Opposition to Settlement Between Ven-A-Care, California, Florida and Schering/Warrick [Docket No. 6479] ○ September 4, 2009 – Reply in Support of Motion for Approval of the Settlement Between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering, and Warrick [Docket No. 6485], Affidavit of Paul F. Charnetzki [Docket No. 6486] ○ September 11, 2009 - United States’ Sur-Reply Support of its Opposition to the Motion to Approve the Proposed Settlement Between Schering-Plough Corporation, Schering Corporation, Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation, California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys [Docket No. 6501] ○ September 11, 2009 – The City of New York and New York Counties’ Sur-Response and Objection to the Motion to Approve the Proposed Settlement Between California, Florida and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering & Warrick [Docket No. 6502] ○ September 11, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Sur-Reply Memorandum in Opposition to Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Between California, Florida and Ven-A-Care and the Schering/Warrick Defendants [Docket No. 6503] ○ September 23, 2009 – Reply in Support of Motion for Approval of the Settlement Between California, Florida, and Relator Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys on Behalf of Itself and the United States and Schering-Plough, Schering, and Warrick [Docket No. 6534] ○ October 2, 2009 – Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Supplemental Sur-Reply Memorandum in Opposition to Joint Motion for Approval of Settlement Between California, Florida, and Ven-A-Care and the Schering/Warrick Defendants [Docket No. 6565]
U.S. ex rel Ven-A-Care of the Florida Keys, Inc. v. Actavis Mid Atlantic LLC, et al., Civil Action No. 08-10852	06-11337		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 30, 2009 – Joint Motion to Modify March 19, 2009 Case Management Order [Docket No. 6333]
State of Arizona ex rel. v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 2:06-45	n/a	D. Ariz.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 11, 2006 – Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for Remand [Docket No. 2974] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 25, 2006 – Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for Remand [Docket No. 3019] ○ October 24, 2006 – Order issued by Judge Patti B. Saris denying Motion to Remand to State Court [Docket No. 3265] ○ October 25, 2006 – Electronic Notice from the Court to Reopen Document #2974 Motion to Remand to State Court

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>State of Arizona ex rel. v. Abbott Labs., Case No. 2:06-45 (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 9, 2006 – Defendant Dey, Inc.’s Supplemental Notice of Removal (<i>leave to file granted on November 2, 2006</i>) [Docket No. 3332] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ November 13, 2006 – Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Response to Defendant Dey, Inc.’s Supplemental Notice of Removal [Docket No. 3355] • June 13, 2008 – State of Arizona’s Motion for Protective Order Limiting Scope of Discovery [Docket No. 5377] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ June 27, 2008 – Defendants’ Memorandum in Opposition to Plaintiff State of Arizona’s Motion for a Protective Order Limiting Scope of Discovery [Docket No. 5410] • September 19, 2008 – Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5598] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ September 19, 2008 – Memorandum in Support of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5599] ◦ December 12, 2008 – The State of Arizona’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss [Docket No. 5768] ◦ January 15, 2009 – Defendants’ Reply to the State of Arizona’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss [Docket No. 5850] • September 19, 2008 – Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and Zeneca Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiff State of Arizona’s First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5602] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ September 19, 2008 – Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and Zeneca Inc.’s Individual Memorandum of Law in Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiff State of Arizona’s First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5603], Declaration of Katharine B. Schmeckpeper in Support of Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and Zeneca Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiff State of Arizona’s First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5604] ◦ December 12, 2008 – The State of Arizona’s Opposition to Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and Zeneca Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss Zoladex [Docket No. 5769] ◦ January 15, 2009 - Defendants AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP and Zeneca Inc.’s Individual Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Support of Their Motion to Dismiss the Plaintiff State of Arizona’s First Amended Complaint [Docket No. 5849] • June 25, 2009 – Motion for Dismissal of Select Defendants with Prejudice [Docket No. 6172]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
State of South Carolina et al. v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., Case No. 3:06-2482	n/a	D.S.C.	
State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP, Case No. 3:06-2914	n/a	Removed to D.S.C.	
State of South Carolina, et al. v. Dey, LP, Case No. 3:06-2925	n/a	Removed to D.S.C.	
State of Iowa v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 07-461	07-cv-12141-PBS	S.D. Iowa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 15, 2009 – Plaintiff’s Emergency Motion to Quash Defendant Purepac Pharmaceutical Co.’s Cross-Notice of Continued Videotaped Deposition of Lynn Donovan [Docket No. 6264] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> July 16, 2009 – Opposition to Plaintiff’s Emergency Motion to Quash [Docket No. 6268]
United States of America ex rel. Linnette Sun & Greg Hamilton v. Baxter Hemoglobin Therapeutics, et al., CA No. 05-736	n/a	D. Colorado	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 14, 2009 – Baxter International Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss Relators’ Complaint [Docket No. 6371] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 14, 2009 – Memorandum in Support of Baxter International Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss Relators’ Complaint [Docket No. 6372], Declaration of Ruchi Jain in Support of Baxter International Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss Relators’ Complaint [Docket No. 6375], Declaration of Michael Bradley [Docket No. 6375-13] September 15, 2009 – Memorandum in Opposition to Baxter International Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss Relators’ Complaint [Docket No. 6506] September 30, 2009 – Baxter International Inc.’s Reply in Further Support of Its Motion to Dismiss Relators’ Complaint [Docket No. 6541]; Declaration of Ruchi Jain in Support of Baxter International Inc.’s Reply [Docket No. 6542] August 31, 2009 – Motion of Relators Linnette Sun and Greg Hamilton to Lift Stay on Discovery to Permit Deposition of Marketing Bureau Research and to Continue Deadline for Relators’ Opposition to Baxter’s Motion to Dismiss [Docket No. 6462] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> August 31, 2009 – Memorandum in Support of Motion of Relators Linnette Sun and Greg Hamilton to Lift Stay on Discovery to Permit Deposition of Marketing Bureau Research and to Continue Deadline for Relators’ Opposition to Baxter’s Motion to Dismiss [Docket No. 6463] September 9, 2009 – Baxter International Inc.’s Opposition to Relators’ Motion to Lift Stay on Discovery [Docket No. 6493] September 21, 2009 – Relators’ Unopposed Motion for Leave to File A Memorandum In Excess of Page Limitation [Docket No. 6512]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
United States of America, et al. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., et al., CA No. 95-1354	n/a	S.D. Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 13, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (43) transferring <i>United States of America, et al. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., et al.</i>, S.D. Florida, Case No. 1:95-1354, to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 2, 2009 - Notice of opposition to proposed transfer filed
United States of America, etc. v. Schering Corp., et al., CA No. 09-10003	n/a	S.D. Florida	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> February 13, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (43) transferring <i>United States of America, etc. v. Schering Corp., et al.</i>, S.D. Florida, Case No. 4:09-10003, to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 2, 2009 - Notice of opposition to proposed transfer filed April 13, 2009 – Opposition of Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation, Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation to the United States’ Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order No. 43 April 17, 2009 – United States’ Reply to the Opposition of Schering Corporation, Schering Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation to the Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 43
The County of Orange v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc., et al., CA No. 07-2777	n/a	S.D.N.Y.	
The State of Mississippi v. Forest Laboratories, Inc. et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-86		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Forest Laboratories, Inc. et al.</i>, N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-86 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44
The State of Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-87		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., et al.</i>, N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-87 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44
The State of Mississippi v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-88		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Boehringer Ingelheim Corp., et al.</i>, N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-88 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44
The State of Mississippi v. Baxter International, Inc. et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-89		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Baxter International, Inc., et al.</i>, N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-89 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44
The State of Mississippi v. Sanofi-Aventis, et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-90		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Sanofi-Aventis, et al.</i>, N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-90 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
The State of Mississippi v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-91		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Schering-Plough Corp., et al., N.D. Mississippi</i>, C.A. No. 3:09-91 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44
The State of Mississippi v. Ivax Corp., et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-94		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 16, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (44) transferring <i>Ivax Corp., et al., N.D. Mississippi</i>, C.A. No. 3:09-94 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 44
The State of Mississippi v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-96		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 21, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (45) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Abbott Laboratories, Inc. et al., N.D. Mississippi</i>, C.A. No. 3:09-96 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 45
The State of Mississippi v. Barr Laboratories, Inc. et al., N.D. Mississippi, C.A. No. 3:09-100		N.D. Mississippi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> September 21, 2009 – Conditional Transfer Order (45) transferring <i>The State of Mississippi v. Barr Laboratories, Inc. et al., N.D. Mississippi</i>, C.A. No. 3:09-100 to D. Mass. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> October 2, 2009 – Motion to Vacate Conditional Transfer Order 45
Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York (S.D.N.Y.) County of Albany (N.D.N.Y.) County of Allegany (W.D.N.Y.) County of Broome (N.D.N.Y.) County of Cattaraugus (W.D.N.Y.) County of Cayuga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Chautauqua (W.D.N.Y.) County of Chemung (W.D.N.Y.) County of Chenango (N.D.N.Y.) County of Columbia (N.D.N.Y.) County of Cortland (N.D.N.Y.) County of Dutchess (S.D.N.Y.) County of Essex (N.D.N.Y.) County of Fulton (N.D.N.Y.) County of Genesee (W.D.N.Y.) County of Greene (N.D.N.Y.) County of Herkimer (N.D.N.Y.) County of Jefferson (N.D.N.Y.) County of Lewis (N.D.N.Y.) County of Madison (N.D.N.Y.) County of Monroe (W.D.N.Y.)	03-cv-10643-PBS	E.D.N.Y. N.D.N.Y. S.D.N.Y. W.D.N.Y.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> March 30, 2005 – County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery From the Schering-Plough Corporation [Docket No. 1459] <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 6, 2005 – Schering Plough’s Opposition to County of Suffolk’s Motion to Renew Its Second Motion to Compel the Production of Discovery [Docket No. 1470] March 3, 2006 – Individual Memoranda of Each Defendant in Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County [Docket No. 2207] (<i>individual memoranda filed by Sanofi-Synthelabo</i> [Docket No. 2220], <i>Wyeth, Sandoz Inc.</i> [Docket No. 2202], <i>Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> [Docket No. 2200]) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> April 17, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Individual Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County [Docket No. 2453] May 11, 2006 – Individual Reply Memoranda of Each Defendant in Further Support of Its Motion to Dismiss (1) the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and Plaintiff Counties Other than Nassau and (2) the Second Amended Complaint of Nassau County [Docket No. 2542] (<i>individual memoranda filed by Aventis Pharmaceuticals</i> [Docket No. 2544], <i>Wyeth, Sanofi-Synthelabo</i> [Docket No. 2550], <i>Ben Venue Labs., Inc.</i> [Docket No. 2540], <i>Sandoz Inc.</i> [Docket No. 2557]) June 2, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Joint Sur-Reply in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Individual Motions to Dismiss [Docket No. 2638]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>County of Nassau (E.D.N.Y.) County of Niagara (W.D.N.Y.) County of Oneida (N.D.N.Y.) County of Onondaga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Ontario (W.D.N.Y.) County of Orleans (W.D.N.Y.) County of Putnam (S.D.N.Y.) County of Rensselaer (N.D.N.Y.) County of Rockland (S.D.N.Y.) County of St. Lawrence (N.D.N.Y.) County of Saratoga (N.D.N.Y.) County of Schuyler (W.D.N.Y.) County of Seneca (W.D.N.Y.) County of Steuben (W.D.N.Y.) County of Suffolk (E.D.N.Y.) County of Tompkins (N.D.N.Y.) County of Ulster (N.D.N.Y.), County of Warren (N.D.N.Y.) County of Washington (N.D.N.Y.) County of Wayne (W.D.N.Y.) County of Westchester (S.D.N.Y.) County of Wyoming (W.D.N.Y.) County of Yates (W.D.N.Y.)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 18, 2006 – Notice of Filing of Brief of the Attorney General of the State of New York as Amicus Curiae [Docket No. 3114] ○ October 12, 2006 – Defendants’ Response to the Brief of the Attorney General of the State of New York as Amicus Curiae and to Plaintiffs’ Post-Oral Argument Submissions [Docket No. 3210] ○ February 9, 2007 – Notice of Supplemental Authority in Further Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Complaint of New York City and New York Counties Other than Nassau [Docket No. 3758] ○ July 11, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Memorandum in Opposition to the Individual Defendant’s Renewed Motions to Dismiss [Docket No. 4453] ○ July 24, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Omnibus Sur-Reply to the Individual Defendant’s Renewed Motions to Dismiss [Docket No. 4499] • March 4, 2008 – New York State Department of Health, Mark Richard Butt, Mary Alice Brankman, Michael A. Falzano and Plaintiffs’ Cross-Motion to Quash Subpoenas Issued by Defendants to the New York State Department of Health and/or its Current and Former Employees [Docket No. 5120] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 4, 2008 – Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Motion to Compel and in Support of Movants’ Cross Motion to Quash Subpoenas Issued by Defendants to the New York State Department of Health and/or its Current and Former Employees [Docket No. 5121] ○ March 21, 2008 – Defendants’ Joint Memorandum in Opposition to Movants’ Cross-Motion to Quash and in Further Support of Defendants’ Motion to Compel Subpoenas Issued by Defendants to the New York State Department of Health and Three Key Witnesses [Docket No. 5154] ○ April 4, 2008 – Reply Memorandum of Law in Further Support of Movants’ Cross-Motion to Quash all Subpoenas Issued by Defendants to the New York State Department of Health and/or Its Current and Former Employees [Docket No. 5199] • November 24, 2008 – Defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (“GSK’s”) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment in the New York County Cases [Docket No. 5706] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 24, 2008 – Memorandum in Support of Defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (“GSK’s”) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment in the New York County Cases [Docket No. 5707], Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (“GSK’s”) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment in the New York County Cases [Docket No. 5708] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ January 5, 2009 – Stipulation for Scheduling with Respect to GlaxoSmithKline’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 5820]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York, et al. (S.D.N.Y.) (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February 11, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Opposition to SmithKline Beecham Corporation, d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (GSK’s) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 5892], Affidavit of Joanne M. Cicala [Docket No. 5892-3] ○ February 12, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation, d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (GSK’s) Motion for Summary Judgment in the New York County Cases [Docket No. 5894], Affidavit of Harris L. Devor [Docket No. 5893] ○ March 4, 2009 – Reply Brief of Defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (“GSK’s”) in Support of Its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment in the New York County Cases [Docket No. 5940] ○ March 19, 2009 - Plaintiffs’ Sur-Reply Memorandum of Law in Opposition to SmithKline Beecham Corporation, d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (GSK’s) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 5960], Affidavit of Joanne M. Cicala [Docket No. 5961]; Affidavit of Harris L. Devor [Docket No. 5962] ○ June 16, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Memorandum of Law in Opposition to SmithKline Beecham Corporation, d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (“GSK’s”) Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6155], Supplemental Affidavit of Joanne M. Cicala, [Docket No. 6152], Second Supplemental Affidavit of Harris L. Devor [Docket No. 6153] ○ July 2, 2009 – Defendant SmithKline Beecham Corporation d/b/a GlaxoSmithKline’s (“GSK’s”) Supplemental Brief, Concerning Rebate Issues, in Support of Its Motion for Partial Summary Judgment in the New York County Cases [Docket No. 6250] • May 15, 2009 – Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims [Docket No. 6052] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 15, 2009 – Defendants’ Memorandum in Support of Their Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims [Docket No. 6053, 6084]; Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims [Docket No. 6054]; Declaration of Kim B. Nemirow Transmitting Deposition Testimony and Hearing Transcripts Relied Upon in Support of Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims [Docket No. 6055]; Affidavit of Dr. Sumanth Addanki [Docket No. 6056]; Affidavit of Cesar A. Perales [Docket No. 6057] ○ June 15, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims and in Further Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Their § 145-B Claim [Docket No. 6147], Plaintiffs’ Response to Defendants’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Supporting Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims [Docket No. 6146], Affidavit of Joanne M. Cicala in Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims [Docket No. 6144]

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York, et al. (S.D.N.Y.) (continued)</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 30, 2009 – FUL Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6218], Affidavit of Dr. Sumanth Addanki [Docket No. 6219] • May 15, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Notice of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6058] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 15, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6076]; Declaration of Harris L. Devor in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6061]; Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6077]; Declaration of Joanne M. Cicala in Support of Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6075] ○ May 15 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Materials Facts Related to Federal Upper Limits (“FULs”) and Applicable to all Thirteen FUL Defendants (the “FUL Thirteen”) [Docket No. 6060]; Plaintiffs’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Barr Laboratories, Inc. [Docket No. 6062]; as to Dey L.P. and Dey, Inc. [Docket No. 6063]; as to Ethex Corporation [Docket No. 6064]; as to Ivax Corporation and Ivax Pharmaceuticals, Inc. [Docket No. 6065]; as to Mylan Laboratories, Inc., Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., and UDL Laboratories, Inc. [Docket No. 6066]; as to Par Pharmaceuticals Company, Inc. and Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. [Docket No. 6067]; as to Purepac Pharmaceutical Co. [Docket No. 6068]; as to Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. [Docket No. 6069]; as to Sandoz, Inc. [Docket No. 6070]; as to Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. [Docket No. 6071]; as to Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation [Docket No. 6072]; as to Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Watson Pharma, Inc. [Docket No. 6073]; as to Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, Inc. [Docket No. 6074] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ June 15, 2009 – Defendants’ Response to Plaintiffs’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of “Undisputed” Facts Applicable to All Defendants and Statement of Additional Undisputed Material Facts [Docket No. 6117] and Declaration of Kim B. Nemirow in Support of Defendants’ Joint Response; Response of Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Watson Pharma, Inc. [Docket No. 6112] and Declaration of Sara Jane Shanahan in Support [Docket No. 6113]; Response of Purepac Pharmaceutical Co. [Docket No. 6115]; Response of Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation [Docket No. 6120] and Declaration of Kim B. Nemirow in Support [Docket No. 6121]; Response of Wyeth

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York, et al. (S.D.N.Y.) (continued)</p>			<p>Pharmaceuticals, Inc. [Docket No. 6122] and Declaration of Kelly Davidson in Support [Docket No. 6123]; Response of Ethex Corporation [Docket No. 6124]; Response of Sandoz Inc. [Docket No. 6129] and Declaration of Raj Gandesha in Support [Docket No. 6130]; Response of Mylan Inc., Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc. and UDL Laboratories Inc. [Docket No. 6131] and Declaration of Christopher C. Palermo in Support [Docket No. 6132]; Response of Barr Laboratories, Inc. [Docket No. 6133] and Declaration of John K. Crisham in Support [Docket No. 6134]; Response of Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. [Docket No. 6135] and Declaration of John K. Crisham in Support [Docket No. 6138]; Response of Dey, L.P. and Dey, Inc. [Docket No. 6137] and Declaration of Sarah L. Reid in Support [Docket No. 6139]; Response of Ivax Corporation and Ivax Pharmaceuticals, Inc. [Docket No. 6140] and Declaration of John K. Crisham in Support [Docket No. 6141]; Response of Par Pharmaceutical Companies, Inc. and Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. [Docket No. 6143] and Declaration of Andrew T. Boone in Support [Docket No. 6145]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ June 29, 2009 – Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. [Docket No. 6213], Declaration of Lauren O. Casazza Transmitting Deposition Testimony and Documents Relied Upon in Support of Defendant Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. [Docket No. 6215] ▪ June 30, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts Related to FULs and Applicable to the FUL Thirteen and Response to Additional Undisputed Material Facts [Docket No. 6224]; Plaintiffs’ Reply Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Sandoz, Inc. [Docket No. 6225]; as to Mylan Laboratories Inc., Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., and UDL Laboratories Inc. [Docket No. 6226]; as to Purepac Pharmaceutical Co. [Docket No. 6227]; as to Wyeth Pharmaceuticals, Inc. [Docket No. 6228]; as to Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. and Watson Pharma Inc. [Docket No. 6229]; as to Par Pharmaceutical Companies Inc. and Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. [Docket No. 6230]; as to Barr Laboratories, Inc. [Docket No. 6231]; as to Dey L.P. and Dey, Inc. [Docket No. 6232]; as to Ethex Corporation [Docket No. 6233]; as to Schering Corporation, Schering-Plough Corporation and Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation [Docket No. 6234]; as to Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. [Docket No. 6235]; as to Ivax Corporation and Ivax Pharmaceuticals Inc. [Docket No. 6237] ▪ July 3, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Local Rule 56.1 Statement of Undisputed Material Facts as to Boehringer Ingelheim Roxane, Inc. [Docket No. 6251] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 15, 2009 – FUL Defendants’ Joint Response in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6116, 6161], Affidavit of Dr. Sumanth Addanki [Docket No.

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York, et al. (S.D.N.Y.) (continued)</p>			<p>6119]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 15, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion for Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs’ “FUL Fraud” Claims and in Further Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Their § 145-B Claim [Docket No. 6147] ○ June 30, 2009 – FUL Defendants’ Joint Reply in Further Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment and in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Partial Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6218], Affidavit of Dr. Sumanth Addanki [Docket No. 6219] ○ June 30, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6223], Reply Affidavit of Joanne M. Cicala in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Issues Relating to the Federal Upper Limit and Under New York Social Services Law § 145-B [Docket No. 6236] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 15, 2009 – Defendants’ Joint Motion to Exclude the Proffered Expert Report and Testimony of Harris Devor, C.P.A. [Docket No. 6126] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 15, 2009 – Defendants’ Memorandum in Support of Their Joint Motion to Exclude the Proffered Expert Report and Testimony of Harris Devor, C.P.A. [Docket No. 6127], Declaration of John K. Crisham Transmitting Documents Relied Upon in Defendants’ Joint Motion to Exclude the Proffered Expert Report and Testimony of Harris Devor, C.P.A. [Docket No. 6128] ○ June 30, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Memorandum to Exclude the Proffered Expert Report and Testimony of Harris Devor, C.P.A. [Docket No. 6220], Declaration of Harris L. Devor in Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion to Exclude Proffered Expert Report and Testimony [Docket No. 6221], Affidavit of Kathryn B. Allen in Opposition to Defendants’ Joint Motion to Exclude the Proffered Expert Report and Testimony of Harris Devor, C.P.A. [Docket No. 6222] ○ July 23, 2009 – Defendants’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Their Joint Motion to Exclude the Proffered Expert Report and Testimony of Harris Devor, C.P.A. [Docket No. 6281] • September 4, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery From Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6487] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 4, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel Discovery From Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6488]; Declaration of Harris L. Devor in Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6489] ○ September 17, 2009 – Defendant Merck & Co., Inc.’s Unopposed Motion for Enlargement of Time [Docket No. 6509] ○ October 5, 2009 – Defendant Merck & Co., Inc.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to

GOVERNMENT ENTITY CASES	MDL DOCKET NUMBER	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
<p>Consolidated County Case (Civil Action No. 01-CV-12257-PBS): City of New York, et al. (S.D.N.Y.) (continued)</p>			<p>Compel [Docket No. 6572], Declaration of Robert B. Funkhouser [Docket No. 6573], Affidavit of Eric M. Gaier, Ph.D. [Docket No. 6574-8]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 7, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Consented-To Motion for Leave to File Reply in Further Support of Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6578] • October 16, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Revised Consented-To Motion for Leave to File Reply in Further Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6593] <p>○ October 23, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Further Support of Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6607], Declaration of Joanne M. Cicala in Support of Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Further Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Merck & Co., Inc. [Docket No. 6608]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • October 23, 2009 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Reply Memorandum in Further Support of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel Discovery from Defendant Merck & Co., Inc., and Exhibits to the Declaration of Joanne M. Cicala in Support Thereof Under Seal [Docket No. 6609]

MDL 1456 STATUS CHART – PRIVATE CLASS CASES

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action	Master File 01-CV-12257-PBS	D. Mass. pursuant to JPML Order	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May 3, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from Defendants Abbott Laboratories, AstraZeneca, Schering Plough, Sicor and Together Rx Defendants <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) [Docket No. 826] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 17, 2004 – Certain Defendants’ Notice of Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Certain Documents and Consent Motion for an Extension of Time [Docket No. 838] ○ May 26, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Schering–Plough (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Schering-Plough</i>) [Docket No. 851] ○ May 27, 2004 – Consent Motion for an Extension of Time to Oppose the Motion to Compel [Docket No. 855] ○ May 27, 2004 – Opposition of the Together Rx Defendants to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents [Docket No. 854] ○ May 28, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant Abbott Laboratories (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to Abbott Laboratories</i>) [Docket No. 857] ○ June 8, 2004 – Notice of Withdrawal of Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period Directed at Defendant AstraZeneca. (<i>Note: withdrawal applies only to AstraZeneca</i>) [Docket No. 863] ○ June 9, 2004 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Compel the Production of Documents Created During the Relevant Time Period from the Together Rx Defendants [Docket No. 864] ○ June 22, 2004 – Order granting Plaintiffs’ Motion to Withdraw Motion to Compel Directed at Abbott Laboratories [Electronic Order] ○ Awaiting scheduling of hearing or ruling by Court as to Together Rx Defendants ○ February 23, 2005 – Third Party Schaller Anderson Inc.’s Objection and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Subpoena • June 14, 2005 – Defendant Sicor Inc. and Sicor Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order with Memorandum in Support <i>sub judice</i> (Magistrate Judge Bowler) [Docket No. 1555] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 28, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order [Docket No. 1568] ○ July 6, 2005 – Motion for Leave to File Reply to Plaintiffs’ Response to Sicor’s Motion for Protective Order [Docket No. 1580]

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 9, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Order Exempting Defendant Abbott Laboratories from Any Order Refusing to Extend Deadline for Track Two Discovery [Docket No. 1875] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 23, 2005 – Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Order Exempting Defendant Abbott Laboratories from Any Order Declining to Extend Deadline for Track Two Discovery [Docket No. 1904] ○ December 1, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Letter to Magistrate Judge Bowler Requesting Postponement of Hearing until Track Two Discovery Issues Resolved • November 28, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16 [Docket No. 1912] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 30, 2005 – Certain Track II Defendants’ Request for Expedited Hearing [Docket No. 1923] ○ November 30, 2005 – Response of Defendant Watson Pharma, Inc. to Plaintiffs’ “Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16” [Docket No. 1924] ○ December 1, 2005 – Order re: Plaintiffs’ Motion for Clarification of Case Management Order #16 [Docket No. 1925] ○ December 9, 2005 – Track II Defendants’ Submission Regarding Discovery Schedule [Docket No. 1950] ○ December 9, 2005 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule [Docket No. 1951] ○ December 9, 2005 – Defendants Baxter Healthcare Corporation and Baxter International Inc.’s Memorandum Regarding Track II Discovery Schedule [Docket No. 1952] ○ December 9, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of Their Proposed Track II Discovery Schedule [Docket No. 1953] ○ December 15, 2005 – Plaintiffs’ Reply to Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule [Docket No. 1964] ○ December 16, 2005 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Motion for Leave to File Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Response to Court Order Regarding Discovery Schedule [Docket No. 1970] • February 16, 2006 – Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to the Order of Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Issued on February 4, 2006 Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 72(a) [Docket No. 2140] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ February 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Assented-to Motion for Leave to Reply to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to the Order of Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Issued on February 4, 2006 to File Such Reply Until March 8, 2006 [Docket No. 2148] ○ March 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Denying Further Discovery of Massachusetts Health Plans [Docket No. 2237]

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Dey, Inc.’s and Abbott Laboratories’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Denying Further Discovery of Massachusetts Health Plans [Docket No. 2238] • February 21, 2006 – United Healthcare, Inc. and United HealthCare Insurance Co.’s Limited Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel [Docket No. 2144] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 10, 2006 – Defendants’ Response to Third Party United Healthcare, Inc. and United HealthCare Insurance Company’s Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Compel [Docket No. 2243] • May 8, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Certify Claims with Respect to Track 2 Defendants [Docket No. 2522] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ May 16, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and a Proposed Class Representative [Docket No. 2584] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May 19, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and Class Representative [Docket No. 2590] ▪ May 24, 2006 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corp.’s Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Join Harold Bean as a Plaintiff and Class Representative [Docket No. 2599] ○ May 16, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Motion to Strike Harold Bean as a Proposed Class Representative [Docket No. 2582] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ May 26, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Strike Harold Bean as a Proposed Class Representative [Docket No. 2608] ○ June 15, 2006 – Defendants’ Individual Memoranda of Law in Opposition to Track 2 Class Certification (<i>individual memorandum filed by each of the Track 2 Defendants</i>) (Redacted versions filed in last week of June/first week of July 2006) [Docket No. 2687] ○ July 19, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Certify Claims With Respect to Track 2 Defendants [Docket No. 2889] ○ August 4, 2006 – Track Two Proposal Concerning the Appointment of a Neutral Expert to Advise the Court on Track Two Class Certification [Docket No. 2957] ○ August 7, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Response to Track Two Proposal Concerning the Appointment of a Neutral Expert to Advise the Court on Track Two Class Certification [Docket No. 2964] ○ August 25, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Memorandum Regarding Harold Bean, in Further Opposition to Class Certification [Docket No. 3018] ○ August 25, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Memorandum in Opposition to Class Certification [Docket No. 3020]

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September 5, 2006 – Plaintiff’s Response to Track 2 Defendants’ Memorandum Regarding Harold Bean [Notice of Filing Under Seal - Docket No. 3063], Declaration of Donald E. Haviland [Docket No. 3065] ○ September 6, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Notice of Supplemental Evidence Relevant to Class Certification [Docket No. 3071] ○ September 11, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Supplemental Filing Regarding the Track Two Defendants’ Motion for Leave to File the Rebuttal Declaration of Steven J. Young in Support of Track 2 Defendants’ Opposition to Class Certification or, in the Alternative, Motion to Strike the Hartman Track 2 Dyckman Rebuttal, Hartman Track 2 Young Rebuttal and the Rosenthal Rebuttal) [Notice of Filing Under Seal - Docket No. 3093] ○ September 11, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Notice of Supplemental Authority Relevant to Class Certification [Docket No. 3094] ○ October 16, 2006 – Class Plaintiffs’ Submission of the “Generics Chart” Pursuant to the Oral Request of the Court During the Class Certification Hearing in Connection with Track 2 (corrected October 17, 2006) [Docket No. 3220; Corrected Docket No. 3223] ○ December 21, 2006 – Track Two Defendants’ Motion to Strike the “Generics Chart” and Proposed Track Two Class Certification Order Submitted by Plaintiffs’ in Support of Their Motion for Class Certification [Docket No. 3499] ○ July 25, 2007 – Defendant Amgen Inc.’s Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Class Certification [Docket No. 4506] ○ August 8, 2007 – Class Plaintiffs’ Response to Amgen and Watson’s Supplemental Opposition to Class Certification [Docket No. 4609] ○ August 23, 2007 – Memorandum of Plaintiffs and Class 1 Representatives Harold Carter, Rev. David Aaronson, and Harold Bean in Response to Defendant Amgen, Inc.’s Supplemental Memorandum in Opposition to Class Certification [Docket No. 4641] ○ August 31, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Track 2 Class Certification Regarding State Law Issues [Docket No. 4675] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ September 21, 2007 – Individual Memorandum of Aventis Pharmaceuticals Inc. in Opposition to Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Track 2 Class Certification Regarding State Law Issues [Docket No. 4738] ▪ September 21, 2007 – Response of Defendants Amgen Inc. and Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc. to Plaintiffs’ Supplemental Memorandum in Support of Track 2 Class Certification Regarding State Law Issues [Docket No. 4740] ○ September 7, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Submission of Supplemental Authority Relating to Track 2 Class Certification and State Law Issues [Docket No. 4691] ○ September 14, 2007 – Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc.’s Response to Class Plaintiffs’ Response to Amgen and Watson’s Supplemental Opposition to Class Certification [Docket No. 4716]

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub Filed by Defendant Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation [Docket No. 2755] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ June 22, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to File Under Seal Plaintiffs’ Memorandum and Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of Steve W. Berman in Support of Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub Filed by Defendant Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation [Docket No. 2754] ○ July 6, 2006 – Warrick’s Memorandum in Opposition to Certain Plaintiffs’ Motion to Quash May 18, 2006 Amended Notice of Deposition of Harvey Weintraub and in Support of Cross Motion for Leave to Take Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony [Docket No. 2840] ○ July 20, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Cross-Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony [Docket No. 2898] ○ August 3, 2006 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation’s Reply Memorandum in Support of Its Cross Motion for Leave to Take the Deposition of Harvey Weintraub for Purposes of Preservation of Testimony [Docket No. 2950-2] • November 2, 2006 – Defendant Immunex Corporation’s Objections to October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Regarding Immunex’s Motion for Protective Order Regarding May 17, 2006, Deposition Notice [Docket No. 3303] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 9, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Memorandum In Response to Immunex Corporation’s Objections to October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler Denying Immunex’s Motion for Protective Order [Notice of Filing Under Seal – Docket No. 3331] • November 6, 2006 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to the October 23, 2006 Order by Chief Magistrate Bowler Re: Amgen Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order Relating to Plaintiffs’ Rule 30(b)(6) Deposition Notice Regarding Sales and Marketing [Docket No. 3323] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 14, 2006 – Amgen Inc.’s Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to Chief Magistrate Judge Bowler’s October 23, 2006 Order Granting Amgen Inc.’s Motion for Protective Order [Docket No. 3361] • February 22, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Third Party Subpoenas [Docket No. 3802] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 8, 2007 – Abbott Laboratories Response to Plaintiffs’ Objections to February 12, 2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories’ Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs’ Third Party Subpoenas [Docket No. 3837] ○ March 23, 2007 – Plaintiffs’ Reply Brief in Support of Their Objections to February 12,

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>2007 Order by Magistrate Judge Bowler Granting Defendant Abbott Laboratories' Motion for Protective Order and Motion to Quash Plaintiffs' Third Party Subpoenas [Docket No. 3915]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • March 22, 2007 – Declaration of G. Raymond Pironti, Jr. Regarding Time Expended for Preparing Direct Testimony via Declaration and Traveling from Tampa, Florida to Boston Pursuant to Subpoena to Appear for Trial Testimony and Request for Reimbursement [Docket No. 3945] • July 13, 2007 – Notice of Submission to Court of Declaration and Request for Determination of Proprietary Filing Under Seal [Docket No. 4460] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ July 27, 2007 – Class Counsel's Response to the Declaration of Donald E. Haviland, Jr. In Response to Court Directive Concerning AstraZeneca Settlement [Docket No. 4510] ○ August 24, 2007 – Declaration of Donald E. Haviland, Jr., in Response to Court Directive Concerning the AstraZeneca Settlement [Docket No. 4660] • August 2, 2007 – Track Two Defendants' Proposed "Road Map" for the Next Phase of Case Preparation, Mediation and Trial [Docket No. 4589] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 1, 2007 – BMS' Brief on Pre-Judgment Interest [Docket No. 4534] ○ August 1, 2007 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation's Memorandum Regarding Class 2 Damages [Docket No. 4537] • August 2, 2007 – Class Plaintiffs' Proposed "Road Map" to Govern Track 2 Proceedings [Docket No. 4590] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ August 6, 2007 – Track 2 Defendants' Response to Plaintiffs' Proposed "Road Map" for Track 2 Proceedings [Docket No. 4599] ○ August 6, 2007 – Watson's Opposition to Class Plaintiffs' Proposed "Road Map" [Docket No. 4601] • August 30, 2007 – Plaintiffs' Supplemental Submission Regarding State Consumer Protection Act Pre-Suit Demand Requirements [Docket No. 4671] • September 7, 2007 – Warrick Pharmaceuticals Corporation's Post-Damages Hearing Submission Concerning Liability and Declaratory Relief [Docket No. 4693] • October 23, 2008 – Plaintiffs' Offer of Proof Regarding Standing of Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corporation Retiree Medical Benefits Trust [Docket No. 5641] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ December 16, 2008 – Plaintiffs' Amended Offer of Proof Regarding Standing of Pirelli Armstrong Tire Corporation Retiree Medical Benefits Trust [Docket No. 5781]

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • November 20, 2008 – [Proposed] Consolidated Order Re: Motion for Nationwide Certification Relating to AstraZeneca and the BMS Group [Docket No. 5691] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ November 24, 2008 – Objection by AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP to the Proposed Order Submitted by Plaintiffs With Respect to the Certification Under Rule 23 of Multistate Cases [Docket No. 5705] ○ November 25, 2008 – Objection by Bristol-Myers Squibb Company to the Proposed Order Submitted by Plaintiffs With Respect to the Certification Under Rule 23 of Multistate Cases [Docket No. 5709] ○ January 26, 2009 – Order to Stay Entry of Multistate Class Certification Order Pending Appeal of Massachusetts Class Judgment [Electronic Order] • February 23, 2009 – Revised Objection to Class Action Settlement and Notice of Intent to Appear of Class Member Patricia Weatherly (<i>re Track Two Settlement</i>) [Docket. No. 5921] • March 2, 2009 – Class Counsel Motion for Entry of an Order Granting Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 5934] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ [Proposed] Final Order and Judgment Granting Final Approval of the Track Two Class Action Settlements, Approving Proposed Allocation of Settlement Funds, and Approving Class Counsel Application of Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Litigation Expenses and Compensation for Class Representatives [Docket No. 5934-2] ○ March 2, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs’ Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 5935]; Declaration of Katherine Kinsella Regarding Class Notice in the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 5936]; Declaration of Eric Miller Regarding Mailing of Notice to Class members [Docket No. 5937] ○ March 2, 2009 – Class Counsel’s Memorandum of Law in Support of Petition for Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses and Compensation to the Class Representatives in Association with the Track 2 Settlement [Docket No. 5938]; Declaration of Marc. H. Edelson in Support of Class Plaintiffs’ Joint Petition for Attorneys’ Fees, Reimbursement of Expenses in Relation to Track 2 Settlement [Docket No. 5939] ○ March 9, 2009 – Objection to Track Two Settlement and Attorney’s Fee Request and Notice of Intention to Appear at Fairness Hearing [Docket No. 5947] ○ March 16, 2009 – Memorandum of Named Consumer Plaintiffs in Opposition to Approval of the Proposed Track Two Nationwide Class Certification and Settlement [Docket No. 5953], Declaration of Donald E. Haviland, Jr. in Support of Memorandum of Named Consumer Plaintiffs in Opposition to Approval of the Proposed Track Two Nationwide Class Certification and Settlement [Docket No. 5954] ○ March 24, 2009 – Revised Memorandum of Named Consumer Plaintiffs in Opposition to Approval of the Proposed Track Two Nationwide Class Certification and Settlement

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>[Docket No. 5971]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • April 9, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs’ Motion for Overlength Brief in Which to Respond to All Objectors to Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6002] ○ April 9, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs’ Response to Objections to Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6003], Declaration of Steve W. Berman in Support of Class Plaintiffs’ Response to Objections to Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6004], Declaration of Thomas M. Sobol in Support of Class Plaintiffs’ Response to Objections to Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6005], Declaration of Jeffrey S. Goldenberg [Docket No. 6006], Declaration of Alex Sugerman-Brozanm, Co-Consumer Allocation Counsel, in Support of Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6007], Declaration of Wells Wilkinson in Support of Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6008], Declaration of Eric P. Lachance Regarding Consumer Class Members [Docket No. 6009] ○ April 21, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs’ Notice of Filing in Support of Their Response to Objections to Final Approval of the Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6015] ○ April 23, 2009 – Reply of Objectors John Pentz, Connie Pentz and Corinna Connick to Class Plaintiffs’ Response to Objections to Final Approval of Track Two Settlement [Docket No. 6021], Affidavit of Edward Cochran [Docket No. 6021-2] ○ April 24, 2009 – Affidavit of Donald E. Haviland, Jr., in Support of Evidentiary Submission for Track Two Fairness Hearing [Docket No. 6026] • March 27, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs’ Motion for Protective Order with Regard to Muriel Tonacchio Deposition [Docket No. 5979] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 27, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Support of Their Motion for Protective Order with Regard to Muriel Tonacchio Deposition [Docket No. 5980]; Declaration of Jennifer Fountain Connolly [Docket No. 5981] ○ April 23, 2009 – Named Consumer Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Class Plaintiffs’ Motion for Protective Order with Regard to Muriel Tonacchio Deposition [Docket No. 6019], Named Consumer Plaintiffs’ Memorandum in Opposition to Class Plaintiffs’ Motion for Protective Order with Regard to Muriel Tonacchio Deposition [Docket No. 6019] • March 27, 2009 – Motion by Prescription Access Litigation, Community Catalyst and Health Care for All to Quash Subpoenas Duces Tecum Served by Don Haviland [Docket No. 5982] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ March 27, 2009 – Memorandum of Prescription Access Litigation, Community Catalyst and Health Care for All in Support of Their Motion to Quash Subpoenas Duces Tecum Served by Don Haviland [Docket No. 5983]; Declaration of Jennifer Fountain Connolly [Docket No. 5984] ○ April 23, 2009 – Named Consumer Plaintiffs’ Response to Motion by Prescription Access Litigation, Community Catalyst and Health Care For All to Quash Subpoenas Duces Tecum

PRIVATE CLASS CASES	MDL DOCKET NO.	ORIGINAL JURISDICTION	STATUS
Master Consolidated Class Action (continued)			<p>[Docket No. 6020], Named Consumer Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Motion by Prescription Access Litigation, Community Catalyst and Health Care For All to Quash Subpoenas Duces Tecum [Docket No. 6020]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 25, 2009 – Class Plaintiffs' Notice of Filing Decision of MDL Mediator Regarding Disposition of Unclaimed Consumer Funds in the GSK Settlement [Docket No. 6171] • August 10, 2009 – Notice of Filing Plan of Allocation of Unclaimed Consumer Funds in the GSK Settlement on Behalf of Certain Participating States [Docket No. 6365] • October 27, 2009 – The Johnson & Johnson Defendants' Unopposed Motion to Extend the Briefing Schedule on the Anticipated Motions for Summary Judgment [Docket No. 6614]